



John.M.Bailey@fakeaddress.net on 09/26/2001 11:01:23 AM

To: psse@notes.ymg.gov, bonnie.fogdall@notes.ymg.gov
cc:

Subject: PSSE Comment

Part of Records Package / Supplement / Correction

RECEIVED

September 26, 2001 11:01:23

SEP 26 2001

IP address: 206.144.167.91

---> Commentors Name: Mr. John M Bailey
---> Organization:
---> Position:

---> The Commentors Address:
---> 20745 West River Road
---> Grantsburg, Wisconsin 54840

---> Email Information:
---> bailey@ilsr.org
---> Add commentor to the mailing list : no

---> Contact Information:
---> fax number : -
---> phone number : 715-4882957
---> organization :
---> position :

--> Comment Text :
Dear DOE-

I am writing to comment on both your Yucca Mountain Preliminary Site
Suitability Evaluation

and the Yucca Mountain Science and Engineering Report. Per an August 25, 2001,
letter from Lake Barrett of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste
Management, I will try to address some of the suggested topics for public
comments that were mentioned.

1. Please provide views concerning whether the scientific documents produced
by DOE provide an adequate basis for finding the Yucca Mountain site is
suitable for development of a repository.

I believe that the DOE secretary cannot make a determination at this time
whether Yucca Mountain is a suitable site for our nation's nuclear waste. I

don't believe that it is a suitable site myself. One glaring reason for this is the fact that thousands of public comments on the inadequacies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement have not yet been addressed. In addition, without a Final Environmental Impact Statement, a detailed transportation plan for the nuclear waste shipments, a finalized guideline for repository siting, or a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) repository licensing rule, the DOE is missing a boatload of data for consideration of site suitability. The public cannot accept a recommendation to move ahead with the Yucca Mountain Project with so many missing pieces.

Yucca Mountain is on disputed territory claimed by the Western Shoshone Indian Nation under the Ruby Valley Treaty of 1863, but is currently held by DOE. An aquifer beneath the site is the only source of drinking water for the closest community. Seismic activity in the area makes it likely that radioactivity from the proposed repository would eventually contaminate the groundwater and surrounding environment.

2. If the DOE Secretary determines that the scientific analysis indicates that the Yucca Mountain site is likely to meet radiation protection standards established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and NRC, should the Secretary recommend the site to the President at this time?

I tend to believe that the risks of transporting high-level radioactive waste across the country are a more important the risks of radiation at the site. In addition, we should not be forcing Nevada's citizens to take the radioactive garbage from across the United States even if the radiation levels at an operating Yucca Mountain are within "acceptable" limits.

70,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive waste from commercial nuclear reactors and DOE weapons sites across the country would be shipped to the proposed Yucca Mountain dump, launching an unprecedented nuclear transportation scheme. Routing projections indicate that tens of thousands of highly radioactive atomic waste shipments would likely pass within half a mile of the homes, schools, and workplaces of 50 million Americans in 43 states over the course of several decades. This is unacceptable.

3. Are there reasons that you believe should prevent the President from concluding that the Yucca Mountain site is qualified for the preparation and submission of a construction license application to the NRC?

For reasons outlined in my previous answer under number 3.

4. What mechanism should be utilized to meet the DOE's legal obligation to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel and high-level nuclear waste?

I think that the existing spent fuel should remain where it is right now - at the various reactor locations around the country. If DOE needs to take

ownership of this waste then they should work with the various utilities and come to some sort of agreement - financial or administrative - that allows the waste to be stored on-site in pool or dry cask facilities. In this way, the citizens of Nevada do not have to put up with everyone else's nuclear waste. Each year nuclear power utilities collect millions of dollars from their customers for the Nuclear Waste Fund and perhaps it might be time for these fees to be raised in order to directly assist utilities with managing and planning for their long-term, on-site nuclear waste storage. It would also send a strong signal to nuclear utilities' ratepayers on the true costs of nuclear power.

The DOE should also begin high-level discussions on how to make a transition from nuclear power to clean sources of energy and electricity in the United States. DOE's obligation and goal should be to figure out a way to stop the generation of nuclear waste since the DOE has spent billions of dollars and still does not have an exceptable long-term storage solution.

It is not legal to force Nevada to become a repository. It is not responsible to continue generating tons and tons of high-level nuclear waste without a long-term storage solution. We need to stop - we need to make a transition to cleaner sources of energy.

thanks for considering my views.

Sincerely,

John Bailey

20745 West River Road

Grantsburg, WI 54840

~~~~~